Activism Against PBS's De-Funding, Critique

Josh M. John.

Introduction

Despite PBS having massive funding cut by the Trump administration, its very much supported by independent funding from the public. Apologists consistently argue the decision to terminate PBS (specifically its branch for children's education, PBS Kids) is jeopardizing an irreplaceable source of learning and community that has defined the United States for several decades. I reviewed the evidence for and against this popular consensus view on the position and have several critiques, which are presented in this paper.

'PBS Defense' Points

Revolutionary progress in learning

The fact itself that PBS Kids has had a recorded impact in preparing younger children for school or assisting in later education, is undeniable. Experts like Hurwitz L.B. have participated in multiple studies that demonstrate children retaining improved literacy skills in ages 2-8 for the following: letter recognition, vocabulary development, and phonological/phonemic awareness. Shows like Daniel Tiger and Sesame Street are consistently praised for skills improving emotional regulation. Overall, PBS Kids is cited as an iconic, recognizable venue based on "civic health" for most people. It is cited as a widely trustworthy source for developing children with high-quality education.

PBS Kids' logo was changed in 2022, the redesign claimed to reflect "modern and inclusive" themes.

Preferable accessibility

The history of PBS Kids goes back to over 50 years ago. Insufficiency in education was rampant with those facing racial prejudice, along with the disabled, lacked education considered as wholesome/adequate. The Public Broadcasting Act charged the (now defunct) Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) to produce programs that could reach a wide audience in

reflecting good values, or at least values they approved. The most memorable of shows, which would become a staple of the network, was Sesame Street; combining entertainment-based methods with comprehensive learning techniques that reached a wider audience in more rural communities. Roughly 99% of Americans have access to public television and radio, making it the perfect environment for such a method of educative communication. A study cited the NPR reached 98.5% of Americans via over a thousand stations with PBS member stations reaching nearly 94% of all households, with many listeners claimed to have no alternative.

A segregated 60s classroom, often cited as a cynical foil to successful education accessibility.

Safety in media

PBS is claimed to provide extensive and accessible material for elder demographics via its news station; if it were to close down, families allegedly would have excessive risk of misinformation. This is because they'd retreat to alternative sources with more partisan views. Maintaining PBS would protects more vulnerable groups from what could be perceived as harmful, as well as its proven worth in the education area. This has steadily been sustained by hundreds of millions in federal funding per year for a stable structure, which can't be thoroughly provided by commercial markets.

REBUTTALS

I'll lay out the flaws for PBS's defense, in technical detail. The arguments of these studies seem somewhat messy, claiming more struggling people are blessed with suitable education and knowledge via a free source on their TV when they can't afford internet, yet simultaneously pressed people would be exposed to misinformation via alternative sources. These would require internet, despite it being claimed PBS's audience was people who couldn't afford it.

To improve the context, the demand for PBS has been grouped into 2 categories:

Group-A; Financially average. They have middle to high flexible access to broad resources, even beyond the education/knowledge field of PBS.

Group-B; The more frivolously they may be laid off, single, or financially strained—practically the more 'rural' area which PBS benefited the most when it came to incompetence in learning.

'Safe media' Critique

"The loss of objective nonpartisan news outlets means more Americans will instead get their news from partisan media sources or otherwise fall down rabbit holes of misinformation."

In reality, it's a very interpretive subject nowadays on what qualifies as 'misinformation.' In this case, it's clearly the label supplied to partisan data; whatever contradicts mainstream media's official narrative. The clear majority of standard outlets (unaffected by PBS's budget cuts), are solidly loyal to mainstream consensus. That's blatantly far from what anyone would typically deem as the 'rabbit holes' defenders describe. While younger people rely primarily on social media which could be cited as a higher risk,

(from left to right) Candace Owens was criticized for 'misgendering' trans people. Despite this context clearly being technical-based, YouTube suspended her multiple times for 'harmful content' and has demonetized her videos. Charlie Kirk frequently dealt with suppression of views, deplatforming attempts, joyful reactions in response to his assassination actually ran rampant. Tucker Carlson worked at Fox News for over 14 years, and was fired after being deemed as dangerous to the company due to his fringe views.

studies like Yale SOM consistently point toward more politically controversial topics being censored in social media, or branded as false. Views challenging topics like moon-landing validity, COVID-19 origins or vaccine treatments are aggressively targeted in a negative light as misinformation, with countless 'debunking' videos. Seasoned content that endorses fringe evidence, is evidently harder to find, being at the receiving end of YouTube's ghosting features. Warnings/notes of 'misinformation' are common, as well as demonetization or even outright removal if the platform dislikes it enough. In the scenario PBS were to fully shut down, its audience is unlikely to be vulnerable to said 'misinformation' these peers are concerned over them ingesting, given the extreme aggression toward defying it. Its even less of a concern to these peers, if the PBS viewer already had a passionate pro-mainstream/official narrative view.

'Preferable accessibility' Critique

If the average household can afford the internet required to find such "partisan" sources cited as risky, they can very plausibly afford a news/education alternative to PBS. When looking at networks like (CNN or New York Times,

etc.), prices can range roughly to-or lower than $20 per month. This is manageable compared to the premium tiers on average social media apps. Of course, while the majority use the free versions of social media apps, the same can be said for alternative television to PBS.

ABC, CBS, & NBC News are just the few biggest known outlets for information less likely to be deemed as harmful by the consensus, especially for someone retreating toward alternatives in the scenario PBS shuts down. Many smaller outlets exist for little to no price, and even ones providing fringe views as the American right of free-speech, are not that big of a deal. Everyone possesses the entitlement to their education of choice—regardless if it's been classified as 'misinformation'. News networks are also wildly available through assets such as Free Ad-supported Streaming TV services like Pluto, Roku Channel, Tubi, or Xumo Play. More importantly, this venue is wildly accessible Group-A/B for cost effective resources of knowledge that have been classified as safe.

'Revolutionary progress in learning' Critique

If PBS shuts down, will that severely cripple Group-B, by cutting off all high-quality education tailored to those with low income? No. This claim's primary purpose, seems simply to boost PBS reputation as an irreplaceable source for learning media (whatever the objective).In actuality, non-profit education assistance is wildly flourishing, and results are hardly far from effective. A typical group B family could find solace in homeschool groups, thrift stores with independent education assets, take children to the library for story-time, or educational programs in-play, etc.

- American Library Association resources highlight libraries' role in serving growing homeschool populations with free programs, story-times, and social spaces—especially vital in rural areas where they create stronger community ties.
- Rural public libraries deliver children's programs, literacy development, and in-person engagement that directly counter isolation—far more interactive, which demonstrably improves child development.
- The National Home Education Research Institute (NHERI) data and studies show homeschooled kid (more commonly in rural areas) have superior peer/adult interactions via co-ops, libraries, sports, and church. This is also coupled by higher self-esteem and community service results.

Its been scientifically demonstrated typical school students, are consistently outperformed by students with homeschool based sources of education. These options are absolutely tailored to people with little to spend in certain venues, and also provide increased physical reading and interaction in live environments. It's also proven that reading from print drives deeper comprehension, retention, and cognitive engagement, which could be found in libraries/bookstores.

- A 2024 meta-analysis cited by Oxford-learnings, reveals of 49 studies confirms print books yield significantly better reading comprehension and deeper learning than digital/screens. Not to mention it's also better for the eyes and brain health.
- Columbia Teachers College study (2024) found children's brains process written texts more deeply in print than on screens—key for critical thinking, not just rote skills.
- EdSource (2023) reports printed material consistently outperforms digital for comprehension.

A concern over Group-B being largely dependent on learning assistance from watching Odd Squad, then spend several more hours staring at the TV for regular entertainment like Sponge-Bob SquarePants, is maximizing screen-time, with It also limits social engagement/brain development, that can only be achieved via interaction with peers.

An episode, teaching emotional regulation with Elmo, cannot replace a 5-year-old practicing behavior in real time, in the increased presence of peers. Another concern is television often fantasizes or represents realities or ideas not so accurate in raw reality. Grover's constant slapstick style comedy which provokes unanimous laughter from most pre-schoolers, would result in a bruised ankle and loud crying were he an actual child who lost crashed their bicycle, just to name an example. Real children might get spankings or views on certain culture /religions enforced by their family that certainly may not be supported on mainstream TV. Its important to distinguish real life versus how real life is portrayed on fictional television. The non-profit options of education for group B I described are not only doable, but evidently more benefit-prone than PBS kids in certain context.

Rather than television based programs trying to balance education with learning, these websites and tools are exclusively about learning which incorporates more "doing" than watching 7 minutes of the cyber chase gang use a bit of math on their mission when you don't have the time to practice it dozens of times in your paper as the remaining 13 minutes are sued up trying to make a entertaining story (semi-hypothetical example).

CHILDREN'S BOOK WEEK:
8 REASONS WHY READING IS GOOD FOR CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH
Reading cultivates empathy and can even improve their social skills.
Books invite them to think and problem solve, thus improving creativity.
The stories of others can help them put their own life into perspective.
Books allow them to escape into other realities and worlds.
Reading can improve their memory and reduce the risk of falling behind.
Reading for pleasure can lower their stress and promote relaxation.
Reading can help development at school and reduce exam anxiety.
Reading before bed can help them establish a regular bedtime routine.
CAMHS

CAMHS Professional's post "8 REASONS WHY READING IS GOOD FOR CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH."

- ABCmouse is the undisputed champion of cost-free digital learning: Age of Learning proved its users showed 2.3-point growth in phonological processing vs. 0.9 in controls (2.5x greater gains) the learning was accelerated by home use and, overall, doubled early skills.
- According to Kindergarten RCT (2016) Children applying themselves to ABCmouse had 33% greater literacy improvement and 48% greater math improvement vs. non users. At-risk/low-performing kids closed achievement gaps by up to 87% with just 45 min/week. Learning loss—a common issue in the summer, had actually been reduced.
- The beefier peer reviewed study (Thai et al., 2016; ERIC/*peer-reviewed*) showed ABCmouse produced accelerated growth in literacy/mark across multiple assessments, providing very strong evidence for the program's success.
- It's superior to PBS kids, or any traditional television based "education" media because it incorporates active practice + adaptivity to produce real skill, not just watching characters do something for a short time whom you can't interact with.

ABCmouse is only the tip of the iceberg: Brainzy, ABCya, Adventure Academy, Adaptive Mind, Spelling City, Khan Academy, are heavily backed by studies as well for education, not robbing kids of the practice of skills/evasion of entertainment simple TV doesn't allow. These venues alone significantly compete, even outright surpass the reputation PBS Kids has gained, for being the only qualified venue our society can farm education with. Group A would have full access to this, as well as more pricy means if doable. Essentially, they would flourish even more than those relying solo on PBS Kids.

Addressing criticism of PBS

Cultural topics

PBS Kids has visibly taken a noticeable stance in prioritizing cultural aspects rather than typical education. Conservatives have frequently attempted to boycott PBS Kids, over exposing youth to drag queens on Sesame Street or homosexual themes; The prime concern among conservatives, was their children at risk of being 'groomed'. Defenders push back hard, claiming it's about "inclusivity", emphasizing it is important to teach children to

acknowledge other families that are different than the typical norm, and that diversity is something everyone can be expected for. A few criticisms with this famous point:

- "Nobody's forcing them to become LGBTQIA. Calling it an agenda is bigotry, as it accuses of us, and LGBTQIA's members themselves for ulterior motives or notorious intentions. Children should be educated about families different than what they typically know. It improves social skills. It helps raise awareness and encourages a society where everyone can be loved & respected for who they are."
  The country of America has over 300 million people in it. Roughly 2% of those registering as gay, with that part of the total LGBTQIA community (queer, bi, non-binary, etc.) rounding up to 9%. The chances of someone, specifically a child coming across a pride-member & completely baffled to see two married men, are statistically low, and could easily be addressed by a parent if such an event ever occurred, or even in private during predation. Some households may prefer evading certain groups entirely to evade influence on children, and PBS's defense for their cultural actions are poor as they ignore blatant mechanics of child physiology & who certain things can vs should be taught by.

Many parents are sensitive about the pride side, not solely because they're discriminative (though some of them are). The main Christian/conservative angle, which includes myself, simply don't want children at risk of being influenced by or adopting LGBTQIA worldviews. Ultimately the evidence for why it is not a good belief system, is irrelevant to justifying a parent being upset with this—they are fully entitled to raising their kids and defining their family's values while it's still their responsibility. Younger people are undergoing active development of their progressing identity as they age, and they are automatically looking for data to contribute to build that personality. The average 3-year-old, or even tween doesn't understand (or care) about something being presented "neutrally" or to say:

"We're not coercing you to a specific view. This is how things are & how this works."

When presented a subject of behavior or belief, the young viewer will have a black n' white mentality of what's subconsciously (or consciously) stored by their brain to learn from and define their identity. They'll perceive it is negative or positive. PBS, or any venue forced to display controversial topics like pride, as wildly positive. This would normalize a trait many non-liberal parents would rather not expose their kids to. There's absolutely nothing wrong with education on math, literacy or skills. The critique is more controversial views, such as religions or belief, should *overwhelmingly* be handled by personal guardians. Replacing positions that should be a father's turf with mainstream TV, is out of the question. It's evident though they haven't pursued the option of stepping back from controversial cultural issues, to let more sensitive topics be handled by those directly responsible for their own kids.

Arthur's episode "Mr. Ratburn and the Special Somebody" was the first major PBS Kids shift toward culturally sensitive topics. Despite being praised by mainstream peers, it garnered significant backlash from parents with strict sensitivity about their kids being exposed to certain orientation ideologies. The episode was banned from Alabama upon initial release.

PBS's refusal to follow through with this very applicable path, implies they'd rather not face backlash from sides comfortable with liberalists, by "discriminating" diversity. Instead, they feel safer to disrespect any parent who consciously wish to NOT have their kids impacted by ideologies portrayed in a light, they don't approve. This rightfully, feels unacceptable. It clearly excels at risks of undermining the most important parental boundaries. Despite this, popular venues in the younger edutainment area like Mrs. Rachael & the Sesame Street producers, surprisingly seem unaware. As people who work with kids, they should know this.

"Surveys consistently show Americans trust NPR and PBS more than most cable or online outlets. Arguably more important is that PBS and NPR reach viewers across the political spectrum—nearly two-thirds of their audience identifies as Republican or independent. PBS prides itself on programming "for everyone," not one political side."

Which families are these studies referring to?

- Pew Research from 2024 showed 54% of U.S. adults (79% of Republicans) support parents opting kids out of sexual orientation/gender identity lessons.
- The EdChoice poll showed Growing pessimism on the K-12 direction, where parents prioritized safety and fundamentals over "cultural" shifts they had absolutely no control over portrayal or influence.
- Parents Defending Education poll (2025): Overwhelming opposition (75%+) to schools withholding gender-identity info from parents; there's strong pushback on equity grading and biological males in girls' spaces.

It may be more fitting to conclude that quote was talking about Americans who at least reflect a mindset, that is at least comfortable, with liberalist themes. Which is fine. But that's only in the scenario they weren't making it look like, that nobody has a problem with trusting PBS's aggressive overstepping on the topics I described. And the claim;

"Not trying to demonstrate a particular political view"

Feels very weak, when virtually literally every aspect in modern PBS shows objectively errs on not upsetting a leftist base, and is rather comfortable with backlash from less mainstream families/communities. Even so, both views have full potential to be satisfied from the alternative education paths for group A & B outlined earlier. Many of the shows on PBS Kids (especially the older ones), are available across many platforms. Group A families can easily tune into 2000s Clifford on Prime Video without worrying about cultural issues—and of course plenty

networks both live & on-demand offer more "inclusive" themes to parents interested in that. Group B at the library will have access to DVDs of countless shows; Including & excluding PBS kids. Within that case, certain portrayals of diversity of appropriate views, are in full control of the family.

Nostalgic bias

There's a growing emotional appeal against PBS Kids' de-funding. Many videos I've found online show people angry, accusing Trump for robbing kids of "good education." It has come to my attention, most of these claims are the result of passionately provoked reactions, to the end of an something deemed as a staple part of our community. The implication these people are conscious over their own nostalgia having to do with PBS, while the kids growing up in 2020s are far from the same education circumstances that PBS kids used to play a pivotal role in.

Gen-Alpha (and certainly Beta) are growing up significantly in-grained with technology/tablets, which have access to the more successful forms of digital education I outlined earlier. Trying to lower screen-time in this generation, is also a notable priority, and very easily complacent with the in-person options to educative assistance I described for group B. Essentially, adults are getting angry over a channel made for children shutting down; despite them no longer being children themselves. Many are more concerned over what they feel PBS meant to *them*, but this blurs with what's actually effective for modern children. It's logically weak such a bias positioned, would be portrayed as a technically formidable.

Review

1. 'Cutting funding to PBS robs of us of high-quality education that's affordable.'

   False. The overwhelming number of alternative sources actually surpasses television-based edutainment in crucial aspects of accessibility, safety and learning abilities. This includes interactivity, reading comprehension and physical interaction. Even so, other edutainment networks will still be there; 'high quality, accessible education' isn't, and never was, only PBS kids.

2. 'Cutting PBS funding makes people more vulnerable to misinformation as they retreat to alternative sources more prone to misinformation or bias views.'

   Misleading. The overwhelming conclusion is sources labeled as fringe & harmful, are actively suppressed and discriminated upon. It's unlikely a viewer of PBS would come across these at all if the program shut down, or even believe them anyway. People who search for more independent opinions purposefully have full right to the information they choose to act on. They don't need to be "protected", and many alternative sources for media exist well within the same accessibility scope of PBS. These all incorporate mainstream views that further downplaying the threat of 'dangerous misinformation.'

3. 'PBS kids has had a major impact on children's learning and literacy. Consistent studies have confirmed this for multiple decades.'

   True. Claiming its success is incapable of being compensated, or surpassed by alternative resources which can appeal to more well off or rural communities, is evidently false territory.

4. 'Taking away PBS kids will rob kids of a means to navigate a world trying to emphasize inclusion, with people who don't follow more traditional norms. This leaves children vulnerable to social ignorance.'

   False. The chance of children coming into contact with diverse groups containing more controversial themes, specifically the LGBTQIA+ community—are much lower and at best can easily be explained by parents without robbing them of the right or enforce the boundaries they would like on their children as they're still responsible for them?

Conclusion:

Evidence overwhelmingly condemns, the rather biased view, that Trump's actions against the program are a threat to society's greatest assets in public learning. The defenses for PBS are unsubstantiated, cherry-picking positive traits to elevate it by ignoring every alternative that easily compensates, or even surpasses it in effectiveness—as well as ignoring the very flaws that garnered support for it being defunded in the first place. Its essentially one big handwave to alternative media.

Citations:

1) https://help.pbs.org/support/solutions/articles/12000106185-is-there-research-that-proves-that-kids-learn-critical-skills-from-pbs-kids-
2) https://publications.lawschool.cornell.edu/jlpp/2026/01/21/counting-the-cost-without-pbs-kids-stop-at-1-2-3/
3) https://www.the74million.org/article/millions-of-kids-learn-through-public-media-why-take-that-away/
4) https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2025/06/pbs-funding-cuts-a-blow-to-children-who-need-it-most/
5) https://oxfordlearning.com/screen-vs-paper-which-one-boosts-reading-comprehension/
6) https://www.tc.columbia.edu/marcomm/what-we-do/media/press-releases/2024/children-derive-deeper-meaning-from-printed-texts-than-screens/
7) https://edsource.org/updates/do-children-learn-more-from-printed-books-than-screens
8) https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2024/jan/17/kids-reading-better-paper-vs-screen
9) https://www.ageoflearning.com/research/abcmouse-2023-rct-research-brief_rgb_03/
10) https://www.abcmouse.com/learn/abcmouse/study-abcmouse-accelerates-kindergarten-learning-through-home-based-solution/17504
11) https://programminglibrarian.org/articles/public-libraries-welcome-growing-homeschool-community
12) https://www.library.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Value-of-Libraries-Community-Hubs.pdf
13) https://www.imls.gov/sites/default/files/publications/documents/rurallibrariesinamericainfographicoverview.pdf
14) https://nheri.org/research-facts-on-homeschooling/
15) https://crowncounseling.com/statistics/public-school-vs-homeschool/
16) https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2024/02/22/public-views-on-parents-opting-their-children-out-of-learning-about-race-and-lgbtq-issues/
17) https://www.edchoice.org/public-parents-more-pessimistic-about-direction-of-k-12-education/
18) https://defendinged.org/press-releases/parents-defending-education-poll-parents-support-girls-only-spaces-in-schools-oppose-parental-exclusion-policies-and-grading-for-equity/
19) https://insights.som.yale.edu/insights/do-social-media-platforms-suspend-conservatives-more
20) https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/08/19/most-americans-think-social-media-sites-censor-political-viewpoints/
21) https://theconversation.com/its-not-just-about-facts-democrats-and-republicans-have-sharply-different-attitudes-about-removing-misinformation-from-social-media-216809
22) https://news.gallup.com/poll/695762/trust-media-new-low.aspx
23) https://www.abcmouse.com/learn/abcmouse/closing-the-achievement-gap-and-minimizing-summer-learning-loss/60858
24) https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1188430.pdf
25) https://www.ageoflearning.com/research/
26) https://khankids.zendesk.com/hc/en-us/articles/360042832631-Research-from-University-of-Massachusetts-Amherst-shows-Khan-Academy-Kids-boosts-pre-literacy-skills
27) https://blog.khanacademy.org/khan-academy-efficacy-results-november-2024/
28) https://www.ageoflearning.com/research/
29) https://www.abcmouse.com/learn/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/AofL-EOY-Impact-Report-2024.pdf
30) https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1180312.pdf

31) https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1286584
32) https://www.abcya.com/blog/clu78h41y001czxh03q7zbbhg/
33) https://www.commonsensemedia.org/website-reviews/brainzy-math-and-reading-program
34) https://www.adaptedmind.com/
35) https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.600687/full
36) https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s43163-026-01001-x
37) https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7943608/
38) https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5078753/
39) https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/internet/candace-owens-youtube-gender-pronouns-video-trans-announcement-rcna88175
40) https://www.theguardian.com/media/2023/oct/31/tucker-carlson-fox-news-book-brian-stelter
41) https://x.com/timurkuran/status/1966166941787427226
42) https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/the-return-of-school-segregation-in-eight-charts/
43) https://www.facebook.com/CAMHSPRO/posts/childrens-book-week-8-reasons-why-reading-is-good-for-childrens-mental-healthchi/4601584009900866/